DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 551 TM 034 653

AUTHOR	Oja, Sharon Nodie
TITLE	Assessing Entry, Retention, and On-the-Job Performance through Graduate Follow Up.
PUB DATE	2002-02-00
NOTE	10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New York, New York, February 24, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Graduates; Cooperation; *Employment Patterns; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Job Performance; Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the collaborative development of an instrument to assess graduates from 1 to 5 years after teacher education program completion. The study shows how a consortium of colleges and universities used the same instrument to gather data for research and program improvement. Examples of research results in the University of New Hampshire Program are discussed, using the total data from the consortium as a frame of reference. The survey instrument is attached. In 1990 a consortium of 11 universities and schools across the United States was formed, and consortium members used the Survey developed at the University of New Hampshire to collect data on their graduates. Data for the first round of research came from 1,394 graduates from 6 institutions. The second round collected data from approximately 3,050 graduates from 11 institutions. Each institution was given data on its own program and on the total of all programs. Data from the University of New Hampshire suggested many significant differences in graduates of 4-year and 5-year programs, and the second round of study continued to look at the differences among 4-year, 5-year, 5-year integrated undergraduate-graduate, and post BA entry programs. The ways such data can be used are discussed, and some comparisons are made between findings for the University of New Hampshire and those for consortium members overall. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 551

Assessing Entry, Retention, and On-the-Job Performance through Graduate Follow Up

Sharon Nodie Oja
University of New Hampshire

Paper presented in the symposium:
Multiple Measures to Ensure Competence of Teacher Education
February 24,2002
AACTE, New York City

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. N. Oja
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Introduction

This paper describes the collaborative development of an instrument to assess graduates from one to five years after teacher education program completion. The paper shows how a consortium of colleges and universities used the same instrument to gather data for research and program improvement. Examples of research results in the UNH Program will be discussed using the total data from the consortium as a frame of reference. A survey instrument is described.

Collaborative Development of an Instrument to Survey Graduates from UNH

A group of colleagues in the UNH Teacher Education Program organized in the late 1980's to investigate the UNH teacher education program and its theory-practice integration. The group named itself the Teacher Education Research Group (TERG). Michael Andrew, Director of Teacher Education at UNH, had begun in 1974 to collect annual program assessment data from interns and cooperating teachers at the end of the internship year, which is the capstone and endpoint of the five-year program. He also collected one-year graduate follow up data on all graduates. Andrew had data on the percent of UNH graduates that entered the profession every year – a percentage that was far higher than the national average. We wanted to know more about our own graduates'

TM034653

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

performance in the classrooms and schools in which they taught. Teacher-as-leader was a theme of our five-year program since its inception in 1974. We wanted to know more about the ways in which our graduates took on leadership roles in the classrooms and schools in which they taught. The UNH Teacher Education Research Group developed the prototype for a Graduate Survey.

A Consortium of Universities Refines the Instrument to Survey All Graduates

In 1990 a consortium of eleven universities and schools across the United States was formed. The Survey was modified and used by these institutions to collect data on their graduates of the prior five years, from 1985-1990. Meetings at UNH, University of Florida at Gainsville, and AACTE annual conferences enabled members of the consortium to meet to conduct analyses and future planning needed during the first Five –Year Graduate Follow up Study and a subsequent study by the consortium in 1996 that surveyed graduates from 1990-1995. Michael Andrew directed the research effort.

The initial consortium consisted of Austin College, Sherman TX; Drake University, DesMoines, IA; the University of Florida, Gainesville, FL; the University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS; the University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH; the University of Vermont, Burlington, VT; Texas A & M University, the University of Nebraska, Oakland University, Oakland, MI; and the University of Rhode Island, and the University of Virginia. The data from the 1st round of the research project comes from 1394 graduates from 1985-1990 at these 11 institutions.

The 2nd round of the study surveyed graduates from the period 1990-1995, approximately 3,050 graduates from 11 institutions. Six (6) institutions from the 1st round of the study [Austin College, Drake University, the University of Florida; the

University of Kansas; the University of New Hampshire; and the University of Vermont] were joined by the following 5 institutions, Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID; Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA; Truman State University, Kirksville, MI; The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AS; and the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

The consortium members in the 1st round of the study shared a special interest in comparing graduates of four-year and extended teacher education programs. Eight (8) of the 11 institutions in the 1st round of the study had integrated five-year teacher education programs (programs for preservice teachers which combine professional studies at both the undergraduate and graduate levels). Four (4) of the 8 (Austin College, University of New Hampshire, University of Kansas, and University of Florida) had pioneered the integrated five-year program movement and had been making plans for this joint research venture as early as 1984. Several consortium members had fifth-year, post-BA entry programs. Other institutions with four-year programs were considering restructuring their teacher preparation programs. A preliminary study of graduates of four-year and five-year programs at the University of New Hampshire (Andrew, 1990) had suggested many significant differences in graduates of four and five year programs. The 2nd round of the study continued to look at differences among four-year, five-year integrated undergraduate-graduate, and post-BA entry programs.

Each institution was given data on its own program and data on the total of all programs. In both rounds of the study there was concern about the consequences of publicizing comparative data. Comparative data was shared anonymously in papers at AACTE and subsequent publications. Some institutions partnered to investigate

comparative data among themselves on particular issues of interest. Outcomes of the 1st round of the study showed that there is a range of quality among all program types. This finding and concerns about use of comparative data led the consortium to choose to emphasize best practices. The 2nd round of the study was named the Benchmark Project, and its goal was to identify and share outstanding practices in preservice teacher education.

The Survey of Graduates

The Survey of Graduates provides research data for each institution and comparative data by which each institution can compare itself to all the institutions in the consortium. While they differ in size and affiliation, all of the consortium institutions have been involved in innovative efforts to restructure and strengthen their teacher education programs. The consortium members share an interest in follow-up of graduates of teacher education programs to gain evidence of performance of their students and the effectiveness of their programs. All the institutions were interested in their graduate's reasons for teaching, graduates' teaching activities or approaches in the classroom, the climate of the schools in which graduates were teaching. Some of the institutions had been focused on development of teacher leadership, and they were very interested in the items on the survey related to leadership of graduates among their peers. Also included were demographic characteristics, information about graduates' current teaching situations, aspects of their teacher education programs, and opinions toward a variety of educational issues.

In the 2nd round of the study a revised Survey of Graduates (see attachment) gave new emphasis to leadership practices of teachers and school context factors that might

support teacher leadership (teachers taking the lead in curriculum development, instructional improvement of self and others, and in supporting school reform). For example, Likert items were added to the leadership practices in Survey question #18 (see #18L, #18M, #18N, #18O, & #18P) and Survey question #17 (see #17F and #17N). Five items were added to the school climate variable (see Items #11C, #11D, #11I, #11J, & #11K).

In the 2nd round of the study items were also added to the Survey of Graduates to get feedback on the effectiveness of teacher education programs (for example, #34, #35, and #36).

Comparative Analyses Using the Data from The Graduate Survey of 11 Institutions

Date from all 11 institutions can be analyzed in a number of ways.

When the survey data from all 11 institutions was used to compare five-year extended programs with four-year programs, the research findings showed that graduates of extended programs of teacher preparation excel over four year program graduates on every major variable in the survey; this includes entry into teaching, retention in teaching, career satisfaction, satisfaction with teacher preparation programs, as well as graduates' self-rating of classroom performance, professional development and leadership behavior. A number of papers and publications have described these results, for example, Andrew (1990), Andrew and Schwab (1993,1995), Baker (1993), and Barton, Andrew and Schwab (1994).

When we used multivariate analysis of the data from all graduates in the 11 institutions in relation to two efficacy items on the Survey of Graduates, Items #19A and

#19D, we found some useful predictors : graduates who have positive feelings of efficacy tend not to rely on traditional teaching methods such as lecture; instead they focus on individualized instruction and cooperative learning. They are leaders among their peers. They have strong feelings of making a personal contribution to society, love their material, and have positive views of student attitudes. We also found that factors influencing the graduates' sense of efficacy tend to be personally- and classroom-related, not school-related (Barton & Oja,1999).

How Does UNH Rate Compared to Other Institutions?

We also used the data from all graduates of the 11 institutions as a frame of reference to which we could compare the data from UNH graduates and to determine how UNH rates compared to all other institutions. For example, Item #34 was one of the questions added to the survey that was used with graduates from 1990-1995. We found that UNH graduates rate their teacher education program very highly (63.7% of UNH graduates rate the UNH program as very good to excellent) compared to graduates of all 11 institutions (51.8% of graduates of all 11 institutions rate their programs as very good to excellent). UNH is in the top 2 of the 11 institutions for graduate rating of their teacher education programs. UNH recently surveyed our graduates from 1995-2000, and we find consistency on our graduates' rating of the UNH teacher education program.

	1990-1995	1995-2000
UNH Graduates Rating of UNH T.Ed. Program (very good to excellent)	63.7%	65.1%

For another example, we refer to Item #19A that asks about graduates beliefs about general teacher efficacy. Item #19A reads: "when it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance

depends on his or her own environment." If a graduate strongly disagrees with item #19A, the graduate is described as having a strong belief in general teacher efficacy. We found that data from 1985-1990 from UNH graduates differed from the data on All graduates of the 11 institutions. On this item, 24.4% of UNH graduates from 1985-1990 strongly believed that teachers, in general, could influence student behavior or performance. UNH graduates were similar to graduates from all 11 institutions in the 1990-1995 sample. When UNH surveyed our graduates from 1995-2000 we again found consistency with the UNH data similar to the UNH graduates of the ten prior years.

#19A General Teacher Efficacy	1985-1990	1990-1995	1995-2000
All graduates of 11 institutions	17.2%	29%	no data
UNH graduates	24.4%	27.6%	27.5%

How Have UNH Graduates Changed Over the Years of the Study?

We also looked at the data from UNH graduates over the fifteen years that the survey has been used, as we wondered about how UNH graduates have changed over the years of the study.

A summary of the UNH Graduates entry and retention data shows consistency over 15 years.

	1985-1990	1990-1995	1995-2000
- Entry into the profession (Taught at least one year)	93%	87%	93%
- Retention (Currently teaching/or in a Teaching Related Job)	90%	85.3%	90%

Examples of changes in other selected variables are shown below.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Few UNH graduates strongly agree that in their school there is sufficient time available for teachers to meet together.

	1985-1990	1990-1995	1995-2000
- #11 A Time for Teachers to Meet) strongly agree	5.7%	12%	5.6%

Only 34% of UNH graduates from 1985-1990 and 37% of UNH graduates from 1990-1995 strongly agree that in their school teachers are involved in curriculum decision making; and the frequency has decreased to 22% in the 1995-2000 UNH graduate sample.

	1985-1990	1990-1995	1995-2000
- #11 F Teachers are Involved in Curriculum strongly agree	34%	37%	22%

In terms of teacher leadership, an expressed goal of the UNH Teacher Education Program, when we compared ourselves to the total data from all 11 institutions, we did not see evidence of how UNH graduates stood out. Frequency data indicates that only 35% of UNH graduates from the 1990-95 sample to 37% of UNH graduates from 1995-2000 data rate the UNH program very good to excellent in preparing them for leadership roles to improve schools.

	1985-1990	1990-1995	1995-2000
- #35 Preparation for Leadership Roles (very good to excellen)t	no data	35%	37%

This self-report data from the UNH graduates is in contrast to the ratings from the school principals where the UNH graduates teach. The results of the Teacher Effectiveness Survey indicate that the school principals of UNH graduates rate the UNH graduates in

the top quartile in terms of instructional performance and leadership. The UNH Teacher Education Program now wants to do follow up studies with our UNH graduates in the schools using qualitatiive and observational methods to investigate leadership behaviors that principals indicated for UNH graduates but that UNH graduates do not self-report.

Summary

By collaborating with a consortium of teacher preparation institutions UNH has developed a frame of reference for program assessment data. UNH faculty continue to analyze results of the Survey of Graduates from 1985-1990, 1990-1995. We have also just begun to review the data on UNH graduates from 1995-2000.

REFERENCES

Andrew, M. D. (1990). Differences between graduates of 4-year and 5-year teacher education programs. Journal of Teacher Education,41(2), 41-51.

Andrew, M.D. & Schwab, R. L. (1993). Outcome based accreditation: Is teacher education ready? Journal of Teacher Education, 44(3), 176-189.

Andrew, M. D., & Schwab, R. L. (1995). Has reform in teacher education influenced teacher performance? An outcome assessment of graduates of an eleven-university consortium. Action in Teacher Education, 17(3), 43-53.

Baker, T. (1993). A survey of four-year and five-year program graduates and their principals. SRATE Journal, 2(2), 28-33.

Barton, R. M., Andrew, M. D., & Schwab, r. L. (1994). Factorial validity and reliability of a survey to assess the teaching effectiveness of graduates of teacher education programs. Educational and Psychologial Measurement, 54(1), 218-226

Barton, R., & Oja, S. N. (1999). Predicting beginning teachers' feelings of efficacy. Educational Research Quarterly, 24(4), 54-65.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM034653

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Assessing Entry, Retention, and On-the-Job Performance Through Graduate Follow Up	
Author(s): Sharon Nodie Oja	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Sharon Nodie Oja	Printed Name/Position/Title: Sharon Nodie Oja, Professor of Ed.
Organization/Address: University of New Hampshire Dept. of Ed., 62 College Rd., Durham, NH 03824 105 B Morrill Hall	Telephone: (603) 862-2379 FAX: (603) 862-2174 E-Mail Address: sno@cisunix.unh.edu Date: 11/12/02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)